

## REMARKS

By this Office Action, the Examiner has required restriction of the above-identified application to one invention under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372, stating that the common special technical feature of the claims as filed is shown in Figure 2 of JP 04078315.

Applicants respectfully submit that JP 04078315 fails to teach a thrust load enhancement device for a rotor-bearing system comprising:

a stator mounted on a rotation axis of the rotor-bearing system;

a rotor separated from the stator by a first magnetic air gap on the rotation axis,  
and

at least one permanent magnet separated from one of: the stator and the rotor by a second magnetic air gap;

wherein the at least one permanent magnet, the stator and the rotor form a magnetic circuit characterized by a flux path so that a flux in the first and second air gaps generates a compensation force between the rotor and the stator that opposes an external force  $F_{ext}$ .

Applicants amend the claims for clarity purpose. Claims 1 and 20 have been amended to recite a first gap and a second gap, between the stator 14 and the rotor 12 and between a permanent magnet 16 and one of the stator 14 and the rotor 12, depending on which of the stator 14 and the rotor 12 the permanent magnet 16 is fixed. The terms first and second only identify between which element the gap is considered. Every element being mounted on the same axis, the gaps are also on the axis.

Applicants amend claim 1 and 20 to recite that the permanent magnet 16 is fixed on one of the stator 14 and the rotor 12, as illustrated in Figures 1 and 5 (fixed on the stator 14), Figure 2 (fixed on the rotor 12), Figures 3 and 4 (each of the stator 14 and the rotor 12 has a permanent magnet 16 fixed thereto). Applicants amend claims 3, 4, and 5 accordingly.

Applicants amend claim 10 so that it depends on claim 5, as supported in

paragraph 0032 of the description as filed.

Applicants amend claim 21 so that it depends on claim 25.

The traversal is on the grounds that the Examiner has failed to establish that a search of the complete application would be an undue burden as required by MPEP 803. MPEP 803 states: “[i]f the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to independent or distinct inventions.” It is Applicants’ position that the Examiner has failed to establish that a search of the entire application constitutes an undue burden. Therefore, it is requested that the entire application be searched and Examined.

In accordance with this election with traverse, applicants reserve all rights in the non-elected claims, including the right to file one or more divisional applications covering the subject matter thereof.

Respectfully submitted,  
SCHNADER HARRISON SEGAL & LEWIS LLP

Dated:

4/14/2008

By:

Joan T. Kluger

Joan T. Kluger  
Reg. No. 38,940  
1600 Market Street, Suite 3600  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
Tel: (215) 751-2357  
Fax: (215) 751-2205  
E-mail: jkluger@schnader.com  
Attorneys for Applicant